EXHIBIT C

In The Matter Of:

LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC., et al.

LEVENTHAL, SHARI D. - Vol. 1
August 18, 2011

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION GOVERNED BYPROTECTIVE ORDER

MERRILL CORPORATION

LegaLink, Inc.

225 Varick Street 10th Floor New York, NY 10014 Phone: 212.557.7400 Fax: 212.692.9171

Page 1

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----X

In re:

: Chapter 11

LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS

INC., et al. : Case No.

Debtors : 08-13555 (JMP)

-----X

LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS :

INC., and OFFICIAL

COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED

CREDITORS OF LEHMAN

BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC., : Adversary

et al.,

: Proceeding No.

Plaintiff and

Plaintiff Intervenor,: 10-03266 (JMP)

VS.

JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.,:

Defendant.

August 18, 2011 9:05 a.m.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION GOVERNED BY

PROTECTIVE ORDER

Video Deposition of SHARI D. LEVENTHAL,
held at the FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK,
33 Liberty Street, New York, New York, before
Frank J. Bas, a Registered Professional
Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New
York.

Page 127

	Tage 12	<u>'</u>
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - S. LEVENTHAL	
2	paragraph 13.	11:30:19
3	Q. We'll get a little bit more	11:30:20
4	into the actual discussions, but just, who	11:30:22
5	at at JPMorgan or representing JPMorgan	11:30:26
6	have you had discussions with about their view	11:30:29
7	on this \$15.8 billion repo issue?	11:30:33
8	A. Steve Cutler. Um, people from	11:30:36
9	Wachtell. I'm not going to try to remember	11:30:40
10	everyone who was involved. And some	11:30:42
11	operations people from Chase. And, again, I'm	11:30:45
12	not going to I'm not great with names, so I	11:30:47
13	am not going to try to remember them.	11:30:49
14	Q. Now, based on your	11:30:51
15	conversations that you have subsequently had	11:30:54
16	with Chase, what do you think Chase thought	11:30:55
17	was the issue that it was discussing on of	11:30:59
18	a dispute with Barclays on the 21st?	11:31:03
19	A. I am not going to speak for	11:31:05
20	what Chase thought it was discussing. I don't	11:31:07
21	know. I can tell you what my recollection is	11:31:09
22	and conversations that I had with Chase after	11:31:12
23	the fact. I don't know what they thought on	11:31:13
24	the 21st.	11:31:15
25	Q. What do you now know is Chase's	11:31:16

Merrill Corporation - New York www.merrillcorp.com/law

		-
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - S. LEVENTHAL	
2	\$15.8 billion issue that it was disputing with	11:31:22
3	Barclays?	11:31:27
4	A. Well, in the time period after,	11:31:28
5	once Barclays learned that it didn't have the	11:31:31
6	7 billion in its account, the issue became	11:31:33
7	Chase had taken the 7 billion out of the	11:31:36
8	account, because it had been under the	11:31:38
9	impression that Barclays was going to assume	11:31:40
10	all of the lending to Lehman, which included	11:31:42
	the, um, 15.8 billion that Barclays had funded	11:31:47
12	on the night of the 17th, I believe, and	11:31:51
13	Barclays in fact didn't do that, which left	11:31:54
14	Chase with that \$15.8 billion repo, because	11:31:57
15		11:32:00
16	Chase unwound and had it intraday on the 18th,	
17	and then they ended up having it, still.	11:32:04
18	So Chase was upset about that,	11:32:06
19	because they felt that Barclays had committed	11:32:08
	that they were going to take the exposure.	11:32:11
20	And Barclays was upset that	11:32:16
21	Chase had taken what it viewed as its \$7	11:32:18
22	billion.	11:32:23
23	Q. At any time that anybody from	11:32:23
24	JPMorgan has described this dispute to you,	11:32:27
25	has JPMorgan ever blamed it on anyone from	11:32:30
i		

Page 129

<u> </u>	raye	129
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - S. LEVENTHAL	
2	Lehman Brothers?	11:32:33
3	A. Not that I recall.	11:32:33
4	Q. In fact, has JPMorgan ever	11:32:35
5	mentioned anyone related to Lehman Brothers in	11:32:37
6	relation to any dispute regarding the \$15.8	11:32:40
7	billion repo?	11:32:44
8	A. I could recall that there were	11:32:45
9	some discussions about the operational issues	11:32:49
10	that took place on the night of the 18th, and	11:32:51
11	there were some discussions about whether	11:32:54
12	who from Lehman was involved in those	11:32:55
13	operational issues.	11:32:57
14	Q. And which operational issues do	11:32:58
15	you recall ever being associated with anyone	11:33:01
16	from Lehman Brothers?	11:33:03
17	A. The transfer of collateral.	11:33:04
18	Q. Meaning that certain collateral	11:33:07
19	did not sufficiently get transferred when	11:33:10
20	Barclays was taking over the Fed, didn't get	11:33:13
21	transferred over to Barclays?	11:33:15
22	A. Right	11:33:16
23	MR. WOLINSKY: Objection.	11:33:17
24	A. Well, there were just issues	11:33:18
25	with the movement of the collateral, and since	11:33:19

Merrill Corporation - New York
www.merrillcorp.com/law

08-13555-mg Doc 19604-3 Filed 08/31/11 Entered 08/31/11 14:33:07 Exhibit C Pg 7 of 16

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION GOVERNED BY PROTECTIVE ORDER SHARI D. LEVENTHAL - 8/18/2011

	Tage 15	-
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - S. LEVENTHAL	
2	Q. Yeah, when it was talking to	11:38:38
3	you about this dispute, you	11:38:39
4	A. My recollection is that it	11:38:41
5	indicated that Barclays had made certain	11:38:43
6	commitments, but I don't know in what form or	11:38:45
7	how.	11:38:47
8	Q. Did JPMorgan ever tell you who	11:38:48
9	in fact told them or communicated to JPMorgan	11:38:51
10	that Barclays was going to continue the	11:38:55
11	financing on the next day?	11:38:57
12	A. No, they didn't tell me who.	11:38:58
13	Q. Do you remember JPMorgan ever	11:39:00
14	telling you that someone from Lehman had	11:39:01
15	caused JPMorgan to believe that Barclays was	11:39:05
16	going to continue financing?	11:39:07
17	A. No, I don't recall that.	11:39:09
18	Q. What about after the services	11:39:17
19	and settlement agreement is executed? You do	11:39:19
20	have discussions with Barclays and JPMorgan,	11:39:22
21	you know, about settling the issues, right?	11:39:24
22	A. Mm-hmm.	11:39:26
23	Q. Did do you ever remember a	11:39:26
24	time of Barclays taking the position that any	11:39:31
25	dispute related to the \$15.8 billion repo had	11:39:35

08-13555-mg Doc 19604-3 Filed 08/31/11 Entered 08/31/11 14:33:07 Exhibit C Pg 8 of 16

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION GOVERNED BY PROTECTIVE ORDER SHARI D. LEVENTHAL - 8/18/2011

r		1
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - S. LEVENTHAL	-
2	started this process of the Fed attempting to	11:40:42
3	mediate this dispute between Lehman and	11:40:44
4	not between Lehman between Chase and	11:40:48
5	Barclays.	11:40:51
6	Q. Do you remember when you	11:40:51
7	received information from Mr. Hughes about	11:40:54
8	Barclays realizing that \$7 billion wasn't in	11:40:56
9	its account?	11:41:00
10	A. I know it was after the 22nd.	11:41:00
11	I don't recall when.	11:41:01
12	Q. And do you think that you heard	11:41:02
13	from Mr. Hughes pretty shortly after Barclays	11:41:04
14	did realize the \$7 billion wasn't in its	11:41:08
15	account?	11:41:11
16	A. I think it was relatively soon	11:41:12
17	after he they learned it, yes. I'm sorry.	11:41:13
18	I think it was relatively soon after they	11:41:20
19	learned it.	11:41:21
20	Q. And what did you do when you	11:41:24
21	heard this from Mr. Hughes?	11:41:26
22	A. As I said, it started a process	11:41:28
23	of mediating the dispute. I recall we reached	11:41:33
24	out to Chase to try to understand their	11:41:36
25	position. There was some back and forth. I	11:41:38

08-13555-mg Doc 19604-3 Filed 08/31/11 Entered 08/31/11 14:33:07 Exhibit C Pg 9 of 16

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION GOVERNED BY PROTECTIVE ORDER SHARI D. LEVENTHAL - 8/18/2011

		•
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - S. LEVENTHAL	
		11.42.01
2	securities were worth far less than the amount	11:43:01
3	that they had extended, than the credit they	11:43:04
4	had extended.	11:43:09
5	Q. So did Chase ever express to	11:43:09
6	you that they believed Barclays' actions had	11:43:12
7	caused JPMorgan to be exposed to the amount of	11:43:17
8	the deficiency between the loan amount and the	11:43:20
9	security value?	11:43:24
10	A. Yeah, I think that's fairly	11:43:24
11	accurate.	11:43:27
12	Q. Did JPMorgan ever express a	11:43:27
13	position that Lehman Brothers was in any way	11:43:32
14	the cause of this deficiency in the value of	11:43:36
15	the securities versus the loan amount?	11:43:43
16	A. Not that I recall.	11:43:45
17	Q. And did anyone from JPMorgan	11:43:45
18	ever blame any particular person at Barclays	11:43:49
19	for creating that exposure?	11:43:52
20	A. No. Not that I recall.	11:43:54
21	Q. And again, did they ever I	11:43:55
22	think you answered but ever name any	11:43:58
23	individual who had made a commitment or	11:44:00
24	from Barclays or caused them to think that	11:44:03
25	Barclays was going to continue that financing?	11:44:06

08-13555-mg Doc 19604-3 Filed 08/31/11 Entered 08/31/11 14:33:07 Exhibit C Pg 10 of 16

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION GOVERNED BY PROTECTIVE ORDER SHARI D. LEVENTHAL - 8/18/2011

r		I age II	Ī
	1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - S. LEVENTHAL	
	2	sound right?	11:50:15
	3	A. I'm not sure.	11:50:15
	4	Q. Okay. Let me understand just	11:50:19
١	5	the scope from a you know, a metaview of	11:50:27
	6	where kind of it goes from here.	11:50:30
	7	So at some point the parties	11:50:33
	8	ask you and the Fed to work in some sort of	11:50:35
	9	kind of mediation context on their dispute, is	11:50:39
	10	that right?	11:50:42
	11	A. Yeah.	11:50:42
	12	Just to clarify going back.	11:50:43
	13	What I think now is that looking at this I	11:50:46
	14	am trying to trigger my memory, but I think	11:50:49
	15	the idea was Chase knew it had the 7 billion,	11:50:51
	16	so to Chase I think the consideration, so to	11:50:54
	17	speak, was dismissal of the lawsuit plus it	11:50:57
	18	had the 7 billion in Lehman's in LBI's	11:50:59
	19	account. Barclays thought it was keeping the	11:51:02
	20	7 billion, so it thought that the only	11:51:04
	21	consideration, I believe, was the dismissal of	11:51:06
	22	the lawsuit. So that's where the problem was.	11:51:09
	23	But anyway, um okay. So now	11:51:14
	24	you were saying?	11:51:16
	25	Q. Luckily we have a transcript.	11:51:17

08-13555-mg Doc 19604-3 Filed 08/31/11 Entered 08/31/11 14:33:07 Exhibit C Pg 11 of 16

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION GOVERNED BY PROTECTIVE ORDER SHARI D. LEVENTHAL - 8/18/2011

1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - S. LEVENTHAL	
2	Q. Throughout this whole time	13:21:04
3	period of fall 2008 did anybody ever discuss	13:21:06
4	an LBHI guaranty? And meaning a guaranty that	13:21:08
5	LBHI had executed with JPMorgan prior to the	13:21:13
6	bankruptcy.	13:21:18
7	A. When?	13:21:19
8	MR. WOLINSKY: Just can we	13:21:20
9	clarify on your calendar, the first day of	13:21:21
10	autumn is September 22.	13:21:22
11	MS. TAGGART: Fair enough. All	13:21:25
12	right. So maybe "fall" isn't the good word to	13:21:26
13	say. Okay.	13:21:30
14	BY MS. TAGGART:	13:21:30
15	Q. Let's just open it as big as	13:21:30
16	possible.	13:21:32
17	Have you ever discussed with	13:21:33
18	anybody anything related to a guaranty that	13:21:34
19	LBHI executed with JPMorgan prior to the	13:21:39
20	Lehman bankruptcy?	13:21:44
21	A. As I think I said earlier, it	13:21:46
22	may have come up in the course of the week of	13:21:49
23	the 15th, but I don't recall.	13:21:51
24	Q. Throughout the negotiations	13:21:53
25	about this dispute did anyone from JPMorgan	13:21:55

08-13555-mg Doc 19604-3 Filed 08/31/11 Entered 08/31/11 14:33:07 Exhibit C Pg 12 of 16

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION GOVERNED BY PROTECTIVE ORDER SHARI D. LEVENTHAL - 8/18/2011

1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - S. LEVENTHAL	
2	ever express, in sum and in substance, that	13:21:58
3	the exposures that resulted from this \$15.8	13:22:02
4	billion repo were guarantied, and so would be	13:22:07
5	paid eventually by LBHI?	13:22:09
6	A. I don't recall that.	13:22:11
7	Q. What about from Barclays; did	13:22:12
8	anybody from Barclays ever say, in sum or	13:22:15
9	substance, you know, don't come after us	13:22:18
10	because you're going to be able to get your	13:22:21
11	money from LBHI pursuant to a guaranty?	13:22:22
12	A. I don't recall. It may have	13:22:25
13	happened, but I don't recall.	13:22:27
14	Q. In any way, did the LBHI	13:22:27
15	prebankruptcy guaranty with JPMorgan have any	13:22:33
16	impact on that settlement negotiation?	13:22:36
17	A. I don't recall it.	13:22:38
18	Q. Did you personally ever form an	13:22:42
19	opinion about whether JPMorgan's concerns	13:22:52
20	about Barclays not fulfilling its commitment	13:22:56
21	was right or wrong?	13:22:58
22	MR. WOLINSKY: Objection.	13:23:00
23	MR. GUNTON: Objection. Can	13:23:02
24	you clarify "commitment"?	13:23:02
25	BY MS. TAGGART:	13:23:05

08-13555-mg Doc 19604-3 Filed 08/31/11 Entered 08/31/11 14:33:07 Exhibit C Pg 13 of 16

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION GOVERNED BY PROTECTIVE ORDER SHARI D. LEVENTHAL - 8/18/2011

	Page	
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - S. LEVENTHAL	
2	THE VIDEO OPERATOR: This	16:07:42
3	concludes today's videotaped deposition. The	16:07:43
4	time is currently 4:07 p.m. This is going to	16:07:45
5	be the end of Tape 3 of 3. We are now off the	16:07:48
6	record.	16:07:50
7		16:07:50
8	(Time noted: 4:07 p.m.)	
9		
10		
11	SHARI D. LEVENTHAL	
12		
13	Sworn and subscribed to before	
14	me, thisday	
15	of, 2011,	
16	in the jurisdiction aforesaid.	
17		
18		
19	NOTARY PUBLIC	
20		
21		i.
22		
23		
24		
25		
		:

		Page	293
1			
2 *	***		
3	ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT		
4	I,, do hereby		
5	acknowledge that I have read and examined the		
6	foregoing testimony, and the same is a true,		
7	correct and complete transcription of the		
8	testimony given by me, and any corrections		
9	appear on the attached Errata sheet signed by		
10	me.		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16	(DATE) (SIGNATURE)		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

		Page	
1			
2	CERTIFICATE		
3	STATE OF NEW YORK)		
4) ss:		
5	COUNTY OF NEW YORK)		
6			
7	I, FRANK J. BAS, a Registered		
8	Professional Reporter and Notary Public within		
9	and for the State of New York, do hereby		
10	certify:		
11	That SHARI D. LEVENTHAL, the witness		
12	whose testimony is hereinbefore set forth, was		
13	duly sworn by me and that such testimony given		
14	by the witness was taken down stenographically		
15	by me and then transcribed.		
16	I further certify that I am not		
17	related by blood or marriage, to any of the		
18	parties in this matter and that I am in no way		
19	interested in the outcome of this matter.		
20	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto		
21	set my hand this 18th of August, 2011.		
22			
23	FRANK J. BAS, RPR		
24			
25			

STATE OF NEW YO	NDIV)		
	עת \		
COUNTY OF NEW V	ss:		
	ORK) make the follow.	ina	
	e following rea		
PAGE LINE(S)	CHANGE	REASON	
	94 - 4 14		
		_1	
		1	
		1	
,			
		1	
1			